

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the subject application. The final Office Action of December 27, 2005 has been received and contents carefully reviewed.

By this Amendment, Applicants amend claim 1 and cancel claims 22-23 without prejudice or disclaimer. Accordingly, claims 1 and 24-32 are currently pending in the present application. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 23, 24 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Lyu et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0001567); rejected claims 1, 22-23 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Mori et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,668,650); rejected claim 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lyu et al. in view of Takeda et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,724,452); rejected claim 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mori et al. in view of Takeda et al.; rejected claims 26 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lyu et al. in view of Yamamoto et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,657,100); rejected claims 26 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mori et al. in view of Yamamoto et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,657,100); rejected claim 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lyu et al. in view of Patel (U.S. Patent No. 5,841,500); rejected claim 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mori et al. in view of Patel (U.S. Patent No. 5,841,500); rejected claims 29-31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lyu et al. in view of Kim et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,335,776); and rejected claims 29-31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mori et al. in view of Kim et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,335,776).

The rejections of claims 1, 23, 24 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Lyu et al. and claims 1, 22, 23 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Mori et al. are respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claim 1 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 1 recites a combination of elements including, for example, "...the auxiliary electrode line and the multi-domain structure distorting an electric field applied between the common electrode and the pixel electrode to thereby form at least two domains in each pixel region during an operation of the multi-domain

liquid crystal display, wherein the auxiliary electrode line is formed between the pixel electrode and the data line at an outside of the pixel electrode in the pixel region and the auxiliary electrode is overlapped with the pixel electrode.” None of the cited references, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 and claims 24 and 32, which depend therefrom, are allowable over the cited references.

The rejection of claim 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over either Lyu et al. or Mori et al. in view of Takeda et al. is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Because Takeda et al. fails to cure the deficient teachings of Lyu et al. and Mori et al. as discussed with respect claim 1, claim 25 is allowable over the cited references.

The rejection of claims 26 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over either Lyu et al. or Mori et al. in view of Yamamoto et al. is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Because Yamamoto et al. fails to cure the deficient teachings of Lyu et al. and Mori et al. as discussed with respect claim 1, claims 26 and 27 are allowable over the cited references.

The rejection of claim 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over either Lyu et al. or Mori et al. in view of Patel is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Because Patel fails to cure the deficient teachings of Lyu et al. and Mori et al. as discussed with respect claim 1, claim 28 is allowable over the cited references.

The rejection of claims 29-31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over either Lyu et al. or Mori et al. in view of Kim et al. is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. As previously presented, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(c), subject matter developed by another person which qualifies as prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) shall not preclude patentability under 35 U.S.C. § 103 where the subject matter in the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same persons or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person. The present application and Kim et al. were, at the time of the invention of the present application, made and owned by LG. Philips LCD Co., Ltd. Moreover, the present application was filed after November 29, 1999; and therefore prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is subject to 35 U.S.C. § 103(c). Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn as Kim et al. is not valid prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Applicants believe the application is in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited. If the Examiner deems that a telephone conference would further the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the telephone number (202) 496-7500. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911.

Dated: March 27, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By:  _____

Eric Nuss

Registration No.: 40,106

MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP

1900 K Street, N.W.

Washington, DC 20006

(202) 496-7500

Attorney for Applicant

Applicants believe the application is in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited. If the Examiner deems that a telephone conference would further the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the telephone number (202) 496-7500. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911.

Dated: March 27, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Eric Nuss

Registration No.: 40,106

MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP

1900 K Street, N.W.

Washington, DC 20006

(202) 496-7500

Attorney for Applicant